



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/993,495	11/27/2001	Doug Rollins	M4065.0486/P486	8165
24998	7590	06/07/2006	EXAMINER	
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP			GELAGAY, SHEWAYE	
2101 L Street, NW			ART UNIT	
Washington, DC 20037			PAPER NUMBER	
			2137	
DATE MAILED: 06/07/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/993,495

Applicant(s)

ROLLINS, DOUG

Examiner

Shewaye Gelagay

Art Unit

2137

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 17, 2006 has been entered.
2. Claims 1-12 and 14-26 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 6-8, 14-20 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Serceki et al. (hereinafter Serceki) U.S. Publication Number 2003/0078072.

As per claim 1:

Serceki teaches a method of updating an encryption key used by a wireless station for encrypted communications with a wired portion of the network, said method comprising:

physically separating a communication device containing an encryption key used in said encrypted communication from said wireless station; (Page 4, paragraphs 42-44)

physically connecting said removed communications device to an encryption key updating device which is connected to a wired portion of said network said wired portion of said network containing an encryption key generator for providing a new encryption key to said updating device; (Page 3, paragraphs 32-33; page 4, paragraph 41)

replacing an existing encryption key in said communications device with a new encryption key from said generator sent over said wired portion of said network; (Page 3, paragraph 33 and 35; Page 4, paragraph 43) and

physically reconnecting said communications device containing said new encryption key with said wireless station of said network. (Page 3, paragraphs 33, 35; Page 4, paragraph 43)

As per claims 6-7, 14, 16 and 26:

Serceki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Serceki further discloses a method wherein said network communications device is configured on a plug-in card and is physically connection to said network by inserting said network communications device into a card tray at said updating device. (Page 3, paragraph 31)

As per claims 8 and 15:

Serceki teaches a wireless network comprising:

a wired station connected to a wired network, (Page 4, paragraph 41) said wired station comprising:

an encryption key generator for generating an encryption key; (Page 3, paragraphs 32-33; page 4, paragraph 41)

a network communication device for transmitting said encryption key over said wired network; (Page 3, paragraph 31) and

a wired encryption key updating device connected to said wired network; (Page 3, paragraphs 32-33; page 4, paragraph 41)

a wireless station wirelessly connected to said network and communicating with said wired network through communications encrypted with an encryption key, (Page 4, paragraphs 42- 44) said wireless station comprising:

a wireless network communication device containing an encryption key, said wireless network communications device being physically disconnectable from said wireless station and physically connectable to an updating device wired to said network to receive and store as a new encryption key transmitted over said wired network by said wired network communications device. (Page 3, paragraph 33 and 35; Page 4, paragraph 43)

As per claim 17:

Serceki teaches a wireless network communications device comprising:

A removable wireless communications network card adapted to be physically connected to and disconnected from a wireless station card interface; (Figure 3)

a storage area said network card which stores an updateable encryption key for use in conducting encrypted wireless network communications, (Figure 3, item 325) said encryption key being updateable when said card is connected to a wired network card interface which supplies a new encryption key. (Page 3, paragraph 33 and 35; Page 4, paragraph 42-43)

As per claims 18 and 19:

Serceki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Serceki further discloses a method wherein card interface for providing a new encryption key is a PCMCIA card interface. (Page 3, paragraphs 31-32)

As per claim 20:

Serceki teaches an encryption key programming system comprising:

an encryption key generator connected to a wired network; (Page 3, paragraphs 32-33; page 4, paragraph 41)

a programming device connected to said wired network for receiving over a wire connection an encryption key from said generator, said programming device being adapted to physically receive a wireless network communications device containing an updatable encryption key and storing said received encryption key in said wireless network communications device. (Page 3, paragraph 31-35; Page 4, paragraph 42-43)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2137

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3, 9-10 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serceki et al. (hereinafter Serceki) U.S. Publication Number 2003/0078072.

As per claims 2-3, 10 and 22-23:

Serceki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Serceki further discloses a network administrator decides to change security keys depending on internal policies at a regular intervals or after detecting a security breach. (Page 3, paragraph 41) Serceki does not explicitly disclose a method wherein said new encryption key is generated at user-defined intervals or on user-specified days. However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Serceki in order to provide a measure of added security for encryption keys whole providing high level of convenience for users. (Page 1, paragraph 2 and 6; Serceki)

As per claims 9 and 21:

Serceki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Serceki further discloses a network administrator decides to change security keys depending on internal policies at a regular intervals or after detecting a security breach. (Page 3, paragraph 41) Serceki does not explicitly disclose a method wherein a new encryption key is a randomly generated encryption key. However, it would have been obvious to a

person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Serceki in order to provide a measure of added security for encryption keys while providing high level of convenience for users. (Page 1, paragraph 2 and 6; Serceki)

7. Claims 4-5, 11-12, 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serceki et al. (hereinafter Serceki) U.S. Publication Number 2003/0078072 in view of Triegeer United States Letter Patent Number 6,226,750.

As per claims 4, 11 and 24:

Serceki teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. Serceki does not explicitly disclose a method wherein said key generator generates a first new encryption key; compares said new encryption key to the previous k encryption keys used in said network; and generates a second new encryption key if said first new encryption key matches any of said k previously used encryption keys.

Triegeer in analogous art, however, discloses a method wherein said key generator generates a first new encryption key; (Col. 11, lines 30-32) compares said new encryption key to the previous k encryption keys used in said network; (Col. 11, lines 39-41) and generates a second new encryption key if said first new encryption key matches any of said k previously used encryption keys. (Col. 11, lines 38-43)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Serceki to include wherein said key generator generates a first new encryption key; compares said new encryption key to the previous k encryption keys used in said network; and

generates a second new encryption key if said first new encryption key matches any of said k previously used encryption keys. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so, as suggested by, Triegeer (Col. 11, lines 38-39) in order to ensure the previous key is not reused.

As per claims 5, 12 and 25:

The combination of Serceki and Triegeer teaches all the subject matter as discussed above. In addition, Triegeer further discloses a method wherein k is a user-defined number of previously used encryption keys. (Col. 11, lines 38-43)

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed April 17, 2006 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See Form PTO-892.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shewaye Gelagay whose telephone number is 571-272-4219. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

Art Unit: 2137

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on 571-272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shewaye Gelagay



EMMANUEL L. MOISE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER